

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants originally submitted Claims 1-14. In previous responses, Claims 6-7 and 10-13 were canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and Claim 14 was withdrawn. In the present response, the Applicants have amended Claims 1-2 and 5. Support for the amendment can be found, *e.g.*, in Figure 8 of the original specification. No other claims have been added or canceled. Accordingly, Claims 1-5 and 8-9 are currently pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,841,624 to Xu, *et al.* (hereinafter "Xu") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,106,630 to Frankel (hereinafter "Frankel"), U.S. Patent No. 6,146,504 to Patadia, *et al.* (hereinafter "Patadia"), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0029895 by Hanamachi, *et al.* (hereinafter "Hanamachi"). The Applicants believe the invention as presently claimed however, is neither shown nor suggested in the cited portions of the cited combination of Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi. More specifically, the Applicants fail to find where the cited portions of the cited combination teach or suggest a removable, detachable pedestal slip cover including a first portion which includes a chuck cavity for receiving a chuck therein as recited in now amended independent Claim 1.

The Applicants fail to find in the cited portions of the cited combination of Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi any teaching or suggestion of a cavity for receiving a chuck. Moreover, the Applicants fail to find any motivation in the cited portions of the cited combination to modify any of

the structures taught in the cited portions of the cited combination include a cavity for receiving a chuck. As such, the cited portions of the cited combination do not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for presently amended independent Claim 1 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9 and allow issuance thereof.

II. Rejection of Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi as applied to Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9 and in further view of Applicants' admitted prior art. As established above, the cited combination of Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for presently amended independent Claim 1. The Examiner has not cited Applicants' admitted prior art to cure the above-noted deficiencies of the cited combination but to teach the subject matter of dependent Claim 3. (See Examiner's Action of June 6, 2000, page 7.) As such, the above cited combination and Applicants' admitted prior art, as applied by the Examiner, does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of amended independent Claim 1 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claim 3 and allow issuance thereof.

III. Rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi as applied to Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 9 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,656,093 to Burkhart, *et al.* (hereinafter "Burkhart"). As established above, the cited combination of Xu, Frankel, Patadia, and Hanamachi does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for amended independent Claim 1. The Examiner has not cited Burkhart to cure the above-noted deficiencies of the cited combination but to teach the subject matter of dependent Claim 8. (*See* Examiner's Action of June 6, 2008, page 7.) As such, the above cited combination and Burkhart, as applied by the Examiner, does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of independent Claim 1 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claim 8 and allow issuance thereof.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-5 and 8-9.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned agent of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Steven J. Hanke". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Steven" and last name "Hanke" clearly distinguishable.

Steven J. Hanke
Registration No. 58,076

Dated: September 5, 2008

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800